UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,789	10/05/2001	Lynn Ann Casey	005222.00135	1077
29638 BANNER & W	7590 02/07/200 ITCOFF, LTD.	EXAMINER		
ATTORNEYS I	FOR CLIENT NO. 00:	PLUCINSKI, JAMISUE A		
CHICAGO, IL	R DRIVE, 30TH FLOC 60606	Ж	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/970,789	CASEY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JAMISUE A. PLUCINSKI	3629		

		JAMISUE A. PLUCINSKI	3629					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. ⊠ The app app for	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on olication, applicant must timely file one of the following olication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Ciods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
	The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.				
have beer under 37 (set forth ir may reduc	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(s) of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended in the second of the second o	f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing dat	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriat nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. ☐ Th∈ filin Not	e Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp g the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter cice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDI</u>								
(a) (b)	e proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be they raise new issues that would require further core they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo). They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);					
(d)	 appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 		ected claims.					
5. 🔲 Ap	e amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 plicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): ewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	:		ŕ				
nor	n-allowable claim(s). r purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		•	-				
hov The Cla Cla Cla	with the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: im(s) allowed: im(s) objected to: im(s) rejected: 11-37 and 42-51. im(s) withdrawn from consideration: 52-55.							
	<u>/IT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>							
bed	e affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu cause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and s not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
ent	e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing ered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o owing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
	ne affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
<u>S</u>	ne request for reconsideration has been considered bu ee Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowan	ce because:				
	ote the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (ther:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
		/Jamisue A. Plucinski/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3629					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The applicant had amdended the claims to make functional limitations postively claimed as well as adding further limitations onto claims 16-18, 25, 31 and 35 and adding new claims 56-58 which would cause further search and consideration of the newly added claim limitations as well as claims..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to the argument of claim 31, the data within the data structure being non-functional: The applicant has stated that the examiner's logic is not correct, and states that data structures are in fact patentable. Data structures are patentable if embodied on a medium, however the information within the data structures are given patentable weight only if the data becomes functional, if further steps in the claim use the specific data. However if the subsequent steps in the claim would be performed the same, regardless of what type if data is being stored, then the data itself is considered to be non-functional. For example, If the data structure stores tasks list data comprising time and date of inspection, and the claim goes on to simply state that the stored task list data is displayed (and not used by the user), then what type of data that is stored is non-functional, cause no matter what type of data is stored the displaying step would be the same. IF the claim stated to display task list data for a specific time and date of inspecition, then the time and date would then become functional. Therefore because the further steps of claim 31 would be performed the same regardless of what specific data is used, then the data becomes non-functional.

With respect to Applicant's arguments of the art rejection: the applicant's arguments are based off of the newly amended claim limitations. As stated above, the amendment to the claims is not being entered, therefore applicant's arguments are not considered to be persuasive.